

*Please share your stories about how Open Access to this article benefits you.*

# The “Brundibár” Project: Memorializing Theresienstadt Children’s Opera

by Rebecca Rovit

2000

This is the published version of the article, made available with the permission of the publisher. The original published version can be found at the link below.

Rebecca Rovit. (2000). The “Brundibár” Project: Memorializing Theresienstadt Children’s Opera. *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art* 22(2):111-122.

Published version: <http://www.dx.doi.org/10.2307/3245896>

Terms of Use: <http://www2.ku.edu/~scholar/docs/license.shtml>



---

The "Brundibár" Project: Memorializing Theresienstadt Children's Opera

Author(s): Rebecca Rovit

Source: *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art*, Vol. 22, No. 2, Berlin 2000 (May, 2000), pp. 111-122

Published by: [Performing Arts Journal, Inc.](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3245896>

Accessed: 16/07/2014 14:04

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*Performing Arts Journal, Inc.* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *PAJ: A Journal of Performance and Art*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# THE BRUNDIBÁR PROJECT

## Memorializing Theresienstadt Children's Opera

Rebecca Rovit

CHORUS: You have to count on friendship, go the way together, to trust in your strength (*Music*) and to stand by one another. Then people will look at you, call you smart and clever because nothing can (*Music*) separate you. We defeated Brundibár, and now it is clear to all; no one can separate us. (*Music*.)<sup>1</sup>

These words come from the triumphant finale of Hans Krása's children's opera, *Brundibár*. The opera, written and composed in 1938 in Prague, was also performed there by boys in an orphanage during the winter of 1942. Rehearsals had barely begun when the opera's conductor, Rudolf Schächter, was transported to the Nazi's model ghetto in Central Bohemia, Terezín, also known as Theresienstadt. Krása, the architect Frantisek Zelenka, some of the original cast, the orphanage director Moritz Freudenfeld, and his son, Rudolf, arrived in Terezín on several transports between April and July, 1943. In September 1943, Schächter initiated a Terezín production of *Brundibár* directed by Rudolf Freudenfeld, who had directed the orphanage performance and brought the vocal score to the ghetto. Zelenka once more designed a stage set for the inmate boys and girls who sang to the accompaniment of a harmonium. The following year, Krása rewrote the opera score to include a variety of musical instruments in what has been described as a "virtuoso ensemble" orchestra.<sup>2</sup>

The Czech-language opera played fifty-five times as part of the ghetto's organized "leisure time activity" or *Freizeitgestaltung*. Eventually, the Nazis exploited the popular opera by stage-managing its productions for an International Red Cross visit to Terezín in June and a bogus propaganda film in the fall of 1944, *Der Führer schenkt den Juden eine Stadt*. But the simple tale of the victory of the innocent over evil may have provided Terezín audiences with an allegory for their situation. A brother and sister sing for money so that they can buy fresh milk for their sick mother. With the help of singing animals, they recover their stolen money from the nasty organ-grinder, Brundibár. Existing production photos from Terezín show the boy in the role of Brundibár wearing a Hitler mustache.

Fifty-six years later, the lyrics from this same story and its finale are being sung all over Germany. From Giessen to Mönchengladbach, in Berlin and Erlangen auditoriums, in Wittlich's old synagogue, German school children and teenagers have been performing *Brundibár* in memory of the Theresienstadt players. Last year, over seven hundred groups and institutions produced one hundred and thirty performances of the opera. For 2000, many more productions have been scheduled by music schools, church youth groups, and high schools, with the support of Germany's Jewish community. The German delegation of an international cultural youth organization, Jeunesses Musicales Deutschland, established the performance project in 1995. The ensembles see their ambitious plan as a pedagogical strategy. One of their goals is to unite international youth through music to "contribute to understanding among countries."<sup>3</sup> The German branch is particularly sensitive to "recent socio-political developments," such as xenophobia.

The *Brundibár* project belongs to what may be a national obsession: how to come to terms with the Holocaust and transmit the memory for future generations. Attempts to memorialize the Holocaust are taking place in Germany on several levels of society. On the federal level, cultural and political leaders have been embroiled in a noisy controversy about Germany's past and German memory. The design and construction of a Holocaust memorial for Berlin lies at the core of this controversy. Meanwhile, locally, the nation-wide phenomenon of touring *Brundibár* performances to German communities suggests a need by teachers and community leaders to guide the "innocent" generation of German youth in acknowledging publicly the systematic murder of millions of Jews. As Chancellor Gerhard Schröder leads the country into the twenty-first century, Germans still wrestle with their tainted past, ambivalent about the degree to which they are accountable to their country's Third Reich history and responsible for its future. Even while Germany reinforces its alliances with its neighbors and embraces ideas of a multicultural society, its citizens seem unable to decide how to commemorate the specter of Auschwitz. The hesitancy with which leaders debate the Holocaust memorial—its shape, its funding, even its site—and the wavering response to the *Brundibár* project demonstrates the differing viewpoints of Germans on the Holocaust and the explosive topic of what Auschwitz means to Germany's young and old.

The still-unbuilt Berlin memorial and the *Brundibár* performance project-as-memorial represent powerful efforts by Germans to remember their past. It is useful to consider the atmosphere in which these types of remembrance are developing. Disagreements among cultural leaders in Germany, for example, provoked a lingering public debate on the Holocaust and Germany's legacy, suggesting the need to develop a "language" to discuss the German past without misunderstanding. It remains to be seen what kind of "language" may develop. Given the war of words waged in 1998 and 1999 by two prominent spokespeople in Germany, this language might be best expressed, however, in a non-verbal form, as in a memorial, perhaps, or through music recovered from the Holocaust. The dispute last year between the late Ignatz Bubis, the former president of the Jewish community in Germany, and Martin Walser, a respected post-war writer, demonstrated that issues of memory,

atonement, and Germany's future will dominate the cultural agenda well into this new century.

It was actually the yet undefined and empty space reserved for the Holocaust memorial—several football fields wide near Berlin's Brandenburg Gate—that provoked Walser's criticism and spurred a feuilleton debate that months later still demands resolution.<sup>4</sup> As he accepted the 1998 Peace Prize for Literature at the Frankfurt Book Fair, Walser referred to the "instrumentalization of Auschwitz," executed with a "moral cudgel" (*Moralkeule*). He claimed that "instead of being grateful for the 'unceasing presentation of our [German] shame,' he was 'beginning to look away.'" This incited Bubis to respond publicly as he spoke in memory of the November 1938 pogroms, charging Walser with "intellectual arson" for suggesting the need to "look away" from the Holocaust by the majority of non-Jewish Germans. The debate gained in fervor daily, then weekly, while other leaders sought to diffuse the angry tone among Germany's intelligentsia. By December 1998, Bubis had pronounced Walser a latent anti-semiter. And the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* arranged for a meeting between Bubis and Walser to reconcile their feelings publicly, while seeking clarity and understanding.<sup>5</sup> Such attempts at public reconciliation regarding Germany's wartime infractions are what prompted the idea to build a memorial to the Holocaust in Berlin.

Over the past ten years, cultural boards, politicians, and juries discussed and accepted an architectural design for a Holocaust memorial in Berlin. The foundation stone was to be laid on January 27, 1999, Germany's official "Holocaust Remembrance Day." But this ritual was delayed by a year and uncertainty still prevails about its actual form. Only recently did the chosen American architect, Peter Eisenman, negotiate the ultimate dimensions for his much-criticized 4.9 acre field of approximately two thousand seven hundred concrete pillars. Over the past year and a half, government officials, including the Cultural Minister, Michael Naumann, developed variations of Eisenman's architectural proposal: Eisenman I (or "pure Eisenman"), Eisenman II, III, and IV. Last June, the German parliament approved "Eisenman II," based on the architect's original model minus some pillars but including an exhibition space. Naumann has reiterated that the memorial will serve as a "genocide watch" institute to house permanent exhibitions.<sup>6</sup> Even after the vote, however, continued opposition to the memorial and the potential contents of its "learning space" have complicated the quest for action in this new century.<sup>7</sup>

Designing a memorial is a little like staging a theatre script or libretto in that one must consider issues of artistic representation, catharsis, and reception. Can or should art be used to represent the enormity of the Auschwitz atrocity? Are not the concentration camps on Berlin's outskirts enough to remind us of the horrors of Hitler's regime without an abstract monument, chosen in part for its aesthetic attributes? Can a visitor's silence and interaction with a field of cold stone and narrow space elicit a physically "direct experience with remembrance" of the victims?<sup>8</sup> Finally, is Eisenman's plan simply "a monumentalization of German

shame,” as Walser originally claimed? Or a potential meeting place for the homeless, neo-Nazis, and graffiti artists?

And what of Daniel Libeskind’s Jewish Museum in Berlin that opened in the spring of 1999? The architectural wonder, shaped like a stretched-out broken Star of David, houses a Holocaust tower and a memorial garden atop slanted pillars, vaguely reminiscent of Eisenman’s proposed pillars. The museum’s sloping basement floors and ceilings, its slivered windows, and its complex system of voids and empty axes evoke feelings of confusion, echoing the paucity of Jewish life in Berlin. The exhibition halls remain empty in the building, already touted as a memorial to the murdered Jews. The Centrum Judaica Museum in the old synagogue on Oranienburger Strasse, the “Topography of Terror” site on top of the former headquarters of the Gestapo, and the Wannsee Villa Museum are also powerful places from which to contemplate Hitler’s regime of terror. Yet German politicians have focused on the vacant space near the Brandenburg Gate, awaiting the construction of a memorial somehow capable of recalling the victims’ plight while assuaging German guilt—integrating history with the present to move towards the future.

This government’s commitment to build a memorial seems rooted in an urgency not only to exonerate Germany of an onerous past, but to effect remembrance in those generations whose consciences are clear vis-à-vis the Third Reich.<sup>9</sup> It is perhaps fitting, then, that young Germans of the *Brundibár* project—in Berlin and elsewhere—are using theatrical performance and the Holocaust to re-enact an opera which was performed during the Holocaust by young Jews. Issues of memory and morality link Berlin’s empty space with the re-enactment by youth groups of *Brundibár*. The anticipated monument and performances of *Brundibár* rely on different modes of presentation to remember the victims of the Holocaust. According to Eisenman, the memorial’s “non-representational, non-symbolic” structure would elicit the question, “why” the Holocaust could happen.<sup>10</sup> The *Brundibár* experiment would ideally use the actual music and story performed during the Holocaust to provoke reflection among participants and audiences about the victims who once sang and watched the original production. At the same time, it could promote empathy by celebrating solidarity and the life spirit that co-existed with eastern-bound transports to Auschwitz from Terezín.

A premiere production of *Brundibár* on January 27, 1999, in Berlin, however, exemplifies the ambivalence of some government leaders towards the project, paying merely “lip service” to a good cause; namely, the Holocaust, but not paying for it. The production also demonstrates the difficulty in preserving the opera in its simplicity without grafting onto the story a lesson in politics for the 1990s. On opening night in the restored Schauspielhaus concert hall at the Gendarmenmarkt, fifty children from Berlin East and West (a deliberately chosen multicultural cast) and an orchestra re-enacted Hans Krása’s optimistic fairytale. The production team added a musical memorial as prelude with quotations from Krása and from a Theresienstadt survivor (and original cast member), emphasizing an ambience heavy

with historical hindsight. “In these times of skinheads and military boots, we were able to teach the kids a lot about power, violence, and ideology,” director Matthias Diem told a reporter about the rehearsal process.<sup>11</sup> In the opera, the two children rely on the help of some animals and school children (and their voices) to overcome Brundibár. Instead of presenting children still innocent in their belief of justice and pure in their dreams of ice cream and fresh fruit, the 1999 Berlin production depicted a milieu in which children clad in gray underwear sifted through a mountain of clothing for costumes.<sup>12</sup> The director had originally planned to throw more than 4000 square feet of netting over the audience, replace Brundibár’s hurdy-gurdy with an enormous Goebbels-style radio, and have the children plant a birch tree onstage in a mound of peat. But by Christmas 1998, it was evident that Diem’s production team would not have enough money to realize such stage effects.

In fact, the directorial decision to use scenographic effects as a commentary on the past was overshadowed by the ultimate cynicism wrought by Berlin leaders. Although the Berlin Senate had pledged in 1999, the year of children, to sponsor the Berlin *Brundibár*, the funds were not transferred for production costs. Other financial commitments were either withdrawn or greatly reduced; one coalition of banks and insurance companies cut their assured 100,000 marks by 70,000, and then paid nothing.<sup>13</sup> After last minute fundraising among the children’s families and private entrepreneurs, the full orchestra played as planned, but the director’s concept had to be revised according to the modest budget allotted the production. The idea to commemorate the past by performing a cultural relic from within the Holocaust initially received great praise and eager sponsors. But a lack of capital prevented the full potential of a theatrical production whose performance history stems from the Holocaust itself.

The complex history of *Brundibár* and its role in Theresienstadt’s organized *Freizeitgestaltung*, make it especially susceptible to the criticism that art created within the Holocaust was coerced and worthless. This criticism may promote the misconception that the *Brundibár* project belongs to the so-called “Holocaust industry,” a term attributed to the rash of Holocaust-related events peripheral to the Berlin memorial debate, such as million-dollar legal suits for surviving Jewish victims and forced laborers from the war. One may wonder why young Germans and their teachers would stage a musical play dedicated to dead children, especially as most of the original *Brundibár* players were doomed.

Jeunesses Musicales Deutschland, however, has invested five years to create a network of institutions extending to the Czech Republic and Poland precisely to prevent misconceptions. The *Brundibár* experience appears to provide young actors and their audiences with a palpable means—music and theatre history of the Holocaust—through which to come to terms with their countries’ national legacies, complicity in World War II, and the erection of ghettos and camps across Europe. During preparation for the productions, the intergenerational project included invited eyewitnesses who explained their past to the actors, a compact disc of Krása’s opera music, a video with interviews from surviving performers, and clips of





*Brundibár* performance, Theresienstadt, June 1944, as seen in the film *Der Führer schenkt dem Juden eine Stadt*. Photo: Courtesy Jewish Museum, Prague.



*Brundibár* performances. Finally, teachers and their students received research materials about Nazi Germany, Terezín, and the ghetto's cultural programs. In studying the opera's background and enacting the roles from librettist Adolf Hoffmeister's allegorical *Brundibár*, then, these youth groups tackled their own relationship to their ancestry, while conveying the optimistic message of those fictional children in the opera who together defeat Brundibár.<sup>14</sup>

Although the young Germans of the *Brundibár* project would seem to have chosen a legitimate method to preserve and transfer memory, musical theatre is not a form that one can morally justify when discussing Holocaust remembrance. It is still taboo-laden to speak of creative art from within the Holocaust. When recurrent criticism focuses on the "instrumentalization" of Auschwitz in the memorial debate for political and even cultural purposes, what criticism may await enthusiasts of the *Brundibár* project or similar attempts to revive the creative attempts from the Holocaust? It may be difficult to imagine that inmates at Terezín, in labor, or concentration camps could summon the strength to perform anything other than work details for their Commandant. But Victor Ullmann, one of Krása's fellow composers and inmates at Terezín, evidently likened the will to create with the will to live.<sup>15</sup> Ullmann, like Krása, participated in the *Freizeitgestaltung*. He composed an opera in the ghetto, *The Emperor of Atlantis*. The opera's allegorical plot was so obviously a commentary on a dictator's demise that the ghetto's Jewish Elders banned the premiere after the dress rehearsal. Ullmann died at Auschwitz. But remnants of his work from Terezín survive along with Krása's music. These relics from hellish times can be as sobering a reminder of the Holocaust as can abstract stone structures.

Controversy may mar attempts to record the fleeting sparks of cultural life amid the overwhelming death of the Holocaust years, 1933–1945. These performances and creations are nonetheless part of the same history encapsulated in the existing memorials, museums, and maps commemorating the devastation wrought by Hitler's regime. As the sixtieth anniversary of the onset of World War II in Europe nears, some of those artists who created theatrical art in camps and ghettos like Terezín have re-emphasized the role of cultural activity from the Holocaust in bringing *Brundibár* back on stage. The presence and the testimony of eyewitnesses may reinforce a significant area of the Holocaust that has been greatly neglected. Our intractable hindsight may prevent us from accepting morally the fact that inmates en route to places like Terezín or Auschwitz, for example, watched cabaret performances at Westerbork while in transit there. Many of the actors and musicians of Terezín and Westerbork did not know what was ahead for many of them; they lived each day for what it was. We have the hindsight to know what happened to inmates destined for Auschwitz. But may we not also try to understand the complexity of human beings?

In this new millennium individuals and international communities seek some sense of closure to the political, social, and cultural problems established by the Shoah; survivors are able to testify about their wartime experiences in hiding, in ghettos,

and in camps. The international Holocaust conference in Washington, D.C. in December 1999 at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum emphasized this point as discussion about reparations for sufferers and the return of Jewish assets prevailed. Delegates also stressed the need to open all Holocaust-related archives to the public by the year 2000. These preparations—and deadlines—may provide future generations with new opportunities to learn about the Holocaust. Sophisticated educational resources and software programs are already available for high school students. In the meantime, directors of emerging Holocaust Studies training centers grapple with how to teach about genocide—a topic also featured at the international conference on the Holocaust this past January in Stockholm.

Perhaps the newest area in documenting the Holocaust complex is the recording of art created and performed by artists—Jews and non-Jews alike—who were imprisoned within the ghettos and concentration camps. Research about aspects of cultural life from the Holocaust, like Krása's *Brundibár*, is only slowly becoming legitimized as a way to memorialize the past. The Berlinale 1999 film festival featured a documentary on the cabarettist Kurt Gerron and his life at Theresienstadt, *Kurt Gerrons Karussell*, while a new documentary on the life of jazz musician, Coco Schumann, of Theresienstadt's "Ghetto Swingers" is in progress.<sup>16</sup> In Great Britain and the United States, several exhibitions of art-work created within camps like Terezín and Auschwitz are in the planning stages.<sup>17</sup> With the opening of archives dedicated to the Holocaust, especially in Eastern Europe, resources—although far from complete—may allow for the further documentation of the visual art and even theatrical art and performance once created within the camps. Diaries recently bequeathed to such institutes as London's Wiener Library provide new information into Terezín's *Freizeitgestaltung*.<sup>18</sup> This emerging trend in revealing untapped sources supports a positive direction of scholarship in which fragments of the Holocaust's cultural legacy may be memorialized.

It seems to me that this is what the *Brundibár* project across Germany is already accomplishing. The opera's lyrics reveal a sense of optimism and survival. In a coda prior to the opera's finale, the children's narrative chorus sings of the future: "New luck begins, though, even when time passes by; in my cradle your grand-child will soon dream."<sup>19</sup> One may ignore the message behind these words to think bitterly of the doomed *Brundibár* actors at Terezín who innocently sang of a future generation that was never born. From all accounts of survivors who performed or watched *Brundibár* again and again at Terezín, however, the opera apparently embodied hope for the future and joy in the music and its message. Surviving members of the orchestra like Paul Aron Sandfort and Thomas Mandl, for example, look back to stress the positive influence and meaning of the performance for the children. Mandl says that this proves what one can do in difficult times "when one is able to think about something other than the next bite of bread. And simply through the power and geniality of this music, *Brundibár* had a heartening effect on the children."<sup>20</sup>

Andrea Kornath, a dedicated music teacher, has shepherded teenage ensembles of modern-day Aninkas and Pepícks since 1997 across stages of small-town auditoriums in Germany. She emphasizes the power and the accessibility of *Brundibár*'s music for today's young actors and their audiences. Her goal is not to use this keepsake from the Holocaust to reinforce a political lesson in combating neo-Nazism. Emphasizing the horrors of the Holocaust over the opera's music, she believes, is not effective pedagogically. Instead, Konrath encourages her students to listen to and understand the joyous and lively quality of the music in which "each animal [character] has a separate motif in the music." Her focus is always on the music; "the full score is difficult and the forty-minute opera should be played without break," she continues. And it does appear to be the music, according to those who were there, that "transmitted itself like a spark" across Theresienstadt just like Karel Svenk's ghetto anthem. "Because it [music from children's opera] was sung with such fervor; because the songs meant something to us.'The victory of good over evil.' Those were our hopes."<sup>21</sup>

Trude Simonsohn, a survivor of Terezín, recalls how the inmates whistled and sang songs from the opera: "There is something in the melody that gives one courage, no?" Zdenka Ehrlich-Fantlová, herself an inmate and actress at Terezín, has described the "thrilling" aspect of attending one of the first *Brundibár* performances in September 1943: "I remember squeezing into the hall where seats and standing room were all crammed. Lovely, healthy, talented kids they were, and all of them prisoners. Their eyes shone with excitement at the fall of wicked *Brundibár*."<sup>22</sup> One of the surviving cast members who played Aninka at Terezín says that the performances provided performers like herself with an alternate reality. She recalls being called her character's name, Aninka, not Gretke, in the ghetto: "It became something that pretended to be normality and was natural. One could suddenly sing. There was a dog, a cat, and a school—all things that didn't exist in our daily lives except in this children's opera."<sup>23</sup> Many survivors who knew *Brundibár* refer to the therapeutic freedom of vicariously living a different life through their "fairytale." Thus they relied on role-playing and music, feeling nourished with "dream foods," as well as with hope for the future.

Ironically, the future generation to whom the *Brundibár* players sang in 1943 and 1944 would be those teenagers—albeit mostly non-Jewish ones—presently performing *Brundibár* for new audiences in Germany and elsewhere. This is where survivors like Simonsohn have contributed by meeting with the youth ensembles and their teachers to help them better understand Terezín and what the real setting of Krása's opera was like. One actress who played the "cat" in Terezín's *Brundibár* admits that she has never forgotten the opera and its music, but she can no longer sing *Brundibár* melodies because it is too difficult for her emotionally. She believes, however, that the children who now learn the opera's roles, including that of the "cat," will "still hear also the children what they sang that time and they are not here [sic]. And they feel that they want to continue. . . . That this children's opera is almost a memorial for the children that did not make it (we are only three survivors from the cast)."<sup>24</sup> Indeed, by relying on the cultural heritage of the blackest period

in their nation's history, the young actors in Germany are performing theatre history to remind contemporary audiences of German past injustice, while paying tribute to the indomitable spirit of Jewish youth which somehow flowered in a sinkhole of horror.

## NOTES

1. This and all translations from German are my own. This citation is from the published piano reduction (Prague: Tempo Publishing, 1993). With the support of the Fritz-Bauer Institute, Frankfurt, and other Holocaust-related documentation centers, Jeunesses Musicales Deutschland has compiled pedagogical materials for *Brundibár* hereafter referred to as Brundibár-Mappe [Research Materials]. This excerpt may be found on pages 41–42. Musicologist Joza Karas, who retrieved the original piano reduction from Terezín survivors, has written about the opera in *Music in Terezín* (New York: Beaufort Books, 1985).

2. See Karas, "Operatic Performances in Terezín: Krása's *Brundibár*" in Rebecca Rovit and Alvin Goldfarb, eds. *Theatrical Performance during the Holocaust: Texts, Documents, Memoirs* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press/PAJ Books, 1999), 194. Schächter was transported to Terezín in November 1941.

3. This comes from the organization's web site: [www.JeunessesMusicales.de](http://www.JeunessesMusicales.de). The research materials on *Brundibár* reinforce this stance. The General Secretary in Germany, Thomas Rietschel, welcomes inquiries at: Jeunesses Musicales Deutschland, Marktplatz 12, 97990 Weikersheim, Germany. Fax: 079-348526. Performances of *Brundibár* are now being scheduled in North and South America. A performance took place last year in Toronto; more recently, performances took place in Colorado, in Pennsylvania's Lehigh Valley, and in Chicago.

4. See interview with Cultural Minister Michael Naumann, *Der Spiegel*, Nr. 18, May 3, 1999, 194–96.

5. Walser's speech was in October. His remarks are cited in many of the following: Gunter Hofmann's interview with Bubis, *Der Spiegel*, November 30, 1998, 52. The speech by Bubis from November 9, 1998, appeared in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (referred hereafter as FAZ) on November 10, 1998, 47. The controversy continued with Klaus von Dohnanyi, "Everyone Could Test His Conscience," FAZ, November 14, 1998, FAZ, November 30, 1998, 50; former president, Richard von Weizsäcker, "The Argument is Getting Dangerous," FAZ, November 20, 1998, 41. In *Die Zeit*, November 26, 1998, Jan Ross wrote "Aus Auschwitz lernen," 3, while Saul Friedländer explored "The Metaphor of Evil," 50. Also see editorials: Marcel Reich-Ranicki, "The Best That We Can Be," FAZ, December 2, 1998, 41; Aleksander Tisma, "We're the Wolves, We're the Lambs," FAZ, December 7, 1998, 49. As the debate continued, letters to the editor increasingly referred to the debate: see FAZ, November 14, 11; FAZ, November 30, 1998, 12. Local newspapers published updated stories on the controversy. See Thomas Gross, "Wie gedenkt man richtig" ["How does one Remember Correctly"], *Der Mannheimer Morgen*, December 3, 1998, 32; Uwe Knüpfer, "Mahnmal or Museum," *Der Mannheimer Morgen*, December 4, 1998, 4. The *Spiegel* issue of November 30, 1998 is entitled "Ist die Schuld vergährt?" ["Has Guilt Expired?"]. Walser met Bubis face-to-face in mid-December. See their exchange in FAZ, "Wir brauchen eine neue Sprache für die Erinnerung" ["We Need a new Language for Remembrance"],

December 14, 1998, Feuilleton, 39ff. ZDF television then aired a live “Holocaust-Debate,” December 15, 1998, 10:45 p.m. Prominent politicians and Bubis (but not Walser) continued the debate until midnight. Meanwhile, *Spiegel* (December 21, 1998) interviewed Michael Naumann last year to discuss the controversy as well as his early preference for a “learning center.” This is just a sampling from several newspapers. Newspapers in other cities like Berlin also covered the debate. Bubis died in the summer of 1999. The German-born American historian, Fritz Stern, became the recipient of the 1999 Peace Prize for Literature. Stern’s October acceptance speech has served to soften Walser’s polarizing views. Stern has warned against putting an end to the public soul-searching that has become part of Germany’s attempts to come to terms with its history. For Stern there is no end to history, nor is there a completely new beginning. The Holocaust is part of history for all Germans. Nonetheless, Germans continue to disagree on how to memorialize the Holocaust.

6. *Der Spiegel*, Nr. 18, May 3, 1999, 195.

7. Fifteen million marks have been authorized for the memorial, but a financial plan for the exhibition space and archive is still under discussion. Leaders of other groups murdered by the Nazis are dissatisfied with the memorial’s commitment to dead Jews. Meanwhile on January 27, 2000, neo-Nazis protested the memorial by marching through the Brandenburg Gate.

8. Eisenman interviewed by Hanno Rauterberg, *Die Zeit*, December 10, 1998, 51.

9. Letters to the FAZ written by survivors of Theresienstadt suggest Germany’s teenage generation as a source of “empathy” for the past and hope for the future. See Evelina Merova and Trude Simonsohn’s letters to FAZ, November 30, 1998, 12.

10. Eisenman in *Die Zeit*, December 1998, 51.

11. In Klaus Umbach, “Schreckenspiel mit Pfiff,” *Der Spiegel*, Nr. 4, January 25, 1999, 191–92.

12. *Ibid.*, 192.

13. *Ibid.*, 192.

14. Jeunesses Musicales Deutschland has compiled an impressive array of resources for educators and music institutions about life in Terezín.

15. This sentiment has been attributed to Ullmann by performers from Terezín like Zdenka Ehrlich-Fantlová, as well as by those who have studied his work.

16. Ilona Ziok’s film on Kurt Gerron features Ute Lemper and Ben Raabe, as well as former cabaret artists of the Jewish Kulturbund like Camilla Spira. An accompanying CD by Warner reproduces songs from Gerron’s German-language “Karrusell” cabaret at Theresienstadt. The Nippon Film Company is producing the Coco Schumann film in Berlin with a screenplay by Roy Kift.

17. Moravian College, Pennsylvania, hosted an exhibition and symposium on Terezín entitled, “Art, Music, and Education: Strategies for Survival,” February 2000. The exhibitions being prepared are “Legacies of Silence: The Visual Arts and the Interpretation of Holocaust Memory,” 2000, London; “The Last Expression: Art from the Archives of Auschwitz,” Mary & Leigh Block Museum of Art, Northwestern University, Fall 2001, Evanston, Illinois.

18. Philipp Manes directed a German-language lecture series and public play readings for Terezín's *Freizeitgestaltung*. His journals are among the Philipp Manes Papers, The Wiener Library, London.

19. This citation comes from pedagogical materials of the Brundibár-Mappe, 41. The positive response by schools to the *Brundibár* project in Germany and in eastern Europe suggests a potential model for American communities in terms of Holocaust remembrance. As mentioned above, some American communities have begun to adopt this model.

20. Mandl in Brundibár-Mappe, Part 3, "*Brundibár* und die Kinder von Theresienstadt. A Radio Feature" by Hannelore Wonshick, transcript, July 21, 1997, Radio Bremen, n.p. This will be referred to hereafter as Brundibár-Mappe, Part 3, Radio Feature.

21. Helga Kinsky in Brundibár-Mappe, Part 3, Radio Feature, n.p.

22. Ehrlich-Fantlová, unpublished English-language translation (by Derek Viney) of "*Calmness is strength,*" said Father, reproduced among excerpted chapters in Rovit and Goldfarb, eds. *Theatrical Performance during the Holocaust*, 241.

23. Greta Klingsberg, née Hoffmeister, in Brundibár-Mappe, Part 3, Radio Feature, n.p.

24. Ela Weissberger, now of the U.S., in Brundibár-Mappe, Part 3, Radio Feature, n.p. At Moravian College's symposium and concert, "Art, Music, and Education as Strategies for Survival" on February 10, 2000, Ms. Weissberger sang the finale with a group of school children.

---

REBECCA ROVIT most recently edited *Theatrical Performance during the Holocaust: Texts, Documents, Memoirs* (with Alvin Goldfarb) for PAJ Publications. The book was the 1999 Finalist of the Morris J. and Betty Kaplun Foundation of the National Jewish Book Award in the Holocaust category. She is currently preparing an exhibition for the Block Museum at Northwestern University, "The Last Expression: Art From the Archives of Auschwitz."

PAJ, NO. 65 (2000) PP. 111–122: © 2000  
The Johns Hopkins University Press